

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/434,498 | 11/05/1999 | MUNEHIRO DATE | ASAIN0058 | 4034 | |
| 113 | 7590 04/02/2002 | | | | |
| GRIFFIN BUTLER WHISENHUNT & SZIPL LLP SUITE PH-1 2300 NINTH STREET SOUTH | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | HESS, BRUCE H | | |
| ARLINGTON, VA 222042396 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1774 | 14 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/02/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | A9-14 | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summany | Application No. | | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Bruce | Hess | Group Art Unit いつつち | | | | |
| -The MAILING DATE of this communication appears | on the cover sheet | beneath the co | orrespondence add | dress— | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION. | EXPIRE | MONTH(S | 6) FROM THE MAIL | ING DATE | | | |
| Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply the period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturent adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | bly within the statutory mexpire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application | ninimum of thirty (3 from the mailing d n to become ABAI | 30) days will be conside late of this communica NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 1 | ered timely. tion. 133). | | | |
| Status | . | 10 | | Λ. | | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-21-01 (ID) | s) and 10-1 | -01 (re | bno noitit | Amendmo | | | |
| ☐ This action is FINAL. | _ | | | | | | |
| □ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 | or formal matters, pr C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 21 | rosecution as t 13. | to the merits is clo | sed in . | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | ; | | | |
| | | _ is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| Of the above claim(s) | is/are v | _ is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| □ Claim(s) land 3-7 | | is/are a | illowed. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| □ Claim(s) | | is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| □ Claim(s) | | | | election | | | |
| Application Papers | : D | require | | | | | |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on | | • • | ea. | | | | |
| ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner | | | | | | | |
| □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| • | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d) | | n | | | | | |
| □ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un □ All □ Some* □ None of the: | der 35 U.S.C. § 119 (| (a)–(d). | | | | | |
| ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been rec | poivod | | | | | | |
| ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been rec | | No | | | | | |
| ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents I | | | • | | | | |
| in this national stage application from the International E | | .2(a)) | | | | | |
| *Certified copies not received: | | | | _• | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | |
| ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s |). <u>10</u> | Interview Sumr | mary, PTO-413 | | | | |
| ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 | | mal Patent Applicati | on, PTO-152 | | | | |
| ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 | | | | • | | | |
| Office Action Summary | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Paper No. _____

Application/Control Number: 09/434,498

Art Unit: 1761

1. Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 USC 112 (first paragraph) as being based upon a non-enabling disclosure.

Absent a disclosure of what materials are employed in order to attain the functional parameters (e.g., heat the heat sensitive layer to a molten state and quickly cool to a solid colored state followed by heating the heat sensitive layer to a color-erasing temperature lower than the melting temperature of the heat sensitive layer) claimed, one of ordinary skill in this art could not make and use the claimed invention. The only materials specifically disclosed are seven types of conventional color developers which can be employed without any restriction with any and all dyestuff precursors (see page 8, lines 8-21). It is submitted that as known color developers, these seven developers have routinely been employed with conventional color formers. Absent any other disclosed materials (e.g., binders or processing additives), one of ordinary skill in this art can only assume that the aforementioned claimed functional parameters are inherent in any and all prior art compositions that contain any of the seven disclosed color developers and any known color former. This unlikely scenario serves as the basis for the art rejection which follows. The more likely scenario is that applicants actually employ particular binders and processing additives which enable their claimed functional parameters to be attained. Absent the identification of these materials, applicants' disclosure is non-enabling.

2. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' statement of the prior.

As noted above, the prior art combination of any one of seven known color developers with a conventional color former would have been an obvious expedient to one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 1761

in this art. "[I] t is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art." In re Swinehart et al., 169 USPQ 226 at 229. The burden is upon "applicant to prove that the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on". In re Swinhart et al., supra.

Bune There

BRUCE H. HESS PRIMARY EXAMINER